

REMARKS

The above-identified Office Action was a final rejection of Claims 1-25 of the referenced application. Specifically, Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,349,299 (hereinafter Spencer) in view of Holtz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,433,800 (hereinafter Holtz).

In a first response to the final rejection, the applicants filed an after-final request for reconsideration. In an Advisory Action dated April 9, 2004 (Paper No. 12) responding to the after-final request, it was stated that the application was still not in condition for allowance. However, it was also indicated that Claim 9 was no longer rejected, but objected to as depending from rejected claims. It was stated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form (presumably including all the limitations of its base and any intervening claims) and worded so as to avoid an antecedent problem concerning the use of the phrase " reviewing each email address" which was removed from the claims in a previous amendment.

While no admission is made that the rejected claims are actually made obvious by the cited references, the applicants have chosen to amend the claims as suggested in the Advisory Action to further the prosecution of the application and expedite its allowance. More particularly, Claims 1-5 have been cancelled and their subject matter incorporated into Claim 9. The cancelled claims represent the base and intervening claims of objected to Claim 9. Thus, Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base and any intervening claims, as suggested. Further, rejected independent Claims 24 and 25 have been cancelled. And finally, all the remaining claims (i.e., 6-8 and 10-23) which were ultimately dependent from now cancelled Claim 1, have been made ultimately dependent from Claim 9 instead. As such they are in condition for allowance as they depend from a now allowable independent claim.

In summary, it is believed that the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 6-8 and 10-23 and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 9, are respectfully requested. In addition, allowance of these claims at an early date is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard T. Lyon
Registration No. 37,385
Attorney for Applicant

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 278-8855